

**From:** [REDACTED]  
[BoardComment](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Electric Car Chargers At The Vet Building  
**Date:** Saturday, December 11, 2021 5:38:58 PM

---

I am resending this to the e-mail address to make sure my comments are read into the record,

Brian Griffin  
Past Commander

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Saturday, December 11, 2021 1:37 PM  
**To:** 'Ossana Terterian' <oterterian@cambriacsd.org>

**Cc:** [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

**Subject:** Electric Car Chargers At The Vet Building

Board, Management and Friends,

Two weeks ago I went down to the American Legion club for a Friday night dinner, with my disabled wife, and I was shocked to find that the Handicapped parking slot had been replaced with two electric vehicle charging stations. Lots of knobby yellow paving was also laid down leading to a staircase? I am a Past Commander of the American Legion and I have been an officer for the last 12 years. We have about 300 people in our American Legion family and many of them are aging and disabled veterans or disabled family members. The one disabled parking slot was always in demand and the only one at the low point of the parking lot and the closest point to enter the American Legion Club. The location is out of view from Main Street traffic. There is only traffic in the area during the 2 hours of the Friday Farmers Market and during the Pinedorado. I was not happy with the location that was chosen without input from the American Legion. Remember that this is the Veterans Memorial Building that is established under the Military and Veterans Code of the State of California and the American Legion Post 432 is a tenant in the building. The action taken directly impacts the members of our post. I have had a series of e-mail exchanges with Dan Weigold that have been polite but unproductive. The only solution he offered was to make a van size handicap slot next to the EVCS. I pointed out to him that was not acceptable since it triples the walking distance that a disabled person would have to negotiate especially at night. The handicap spot that was taken away was already van accessible. My counter offer was to give us that spot back, add one more handicap spot next to it. The suggestion that most of the people I have talked to about this is that the EVCS be moved to the front of the Veterans Building or on the west side up close to the

street. I think the spot where they were put was done so because it was the closest to a power supply and was the most economical approach. However the cheapest way is not the best way. I found out that anyone using this service has to use a credit card to pay for the charging and that pays for the electricity used as well as recouping the cost of the equipment. I was pleased to learn that the Cambria Chamber of Commerce and the 160 businesses represented are also disappointed in the location for the EVCS. The concept of having these is a great idea for the community but the location where they are is not. The Chamber of Commerce and American Legion Post 432 would be willing to help to move the ECVS to a place more accessible to the public and more likely to be used on a regular basis. It is hard to understand why anyone would think that taking away a handicap parking space and moving it further away from a building access point would be a good idea? It is especially egregious because it is happening at the Veterans Memorial Building and directly impacts disabled veterans and their families. Please do the right things and move the ECVS. We will try to help. I request that this become part of the official record on this matter.

Brian Griffin  
Past Commander  
American Legion Post 432

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [BoardComment](#); [Donn Howell](#); [Karen Dean](#); [Cindy Steidel](#); [Harry Farmer](#); [Tom Gray](#); [John F. Weigold IV](#); [Ray Dienzo](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment on Utilities Report 12-16-21 Agenda Item 7.D.  
**Date:** Wednesday, December 15, 2021 7:03:37 PM

---

- We have reviewed the Utilities Report on the Instream Flow Study - Task 2 - WRF Project Operations, and we request clarification of the schedule for receiving and reviewing the Todd Groundwater technical memorandum about groundwater modeling of WRF operations.
- The Utilities Report states that the Adaptive Management Program Report and the Todd technical memorandum will be presented to the Board in "late winter".
- The contract with Todd Groundwater states that the draft technical memorandum will be provided to the District in December and the final version will be provided in January.
- When does the District expect to receive the draft and final versions of the Todd Groundwater technical memorandum on groundwater modeling of WFR pumping for Board and R&I Committee review?

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Ossana Terterian](#)  
**Cc:** [John F. Weigold IV](#); [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** 6 C Public comment  
**Date:** Thursday, December 16, 2021 2:47:57 PM  
**Importance:** High

---

PROS Master Plan Nov 21, 1994 (as in this Board Packet) seems good as is. It states the structure and duties of PROS at that time and seems relevant as is with. Bike and Walking trails throughout Cambria as remaining unserved duties.

However, Since the community gained ownership of the Fiscalinni Ranch the Use of the active recreation on the East Ranch HAS been defined in the "Conceptual Park Plan of 2003"

And further defined in the North Coast Area Plan for Cambria and San Simeon adopted by the SLO county Board of Supervisors in 2008.

Also, The Final MEIR adopted in September 2009 ( Especially Table IV-1 ) provided detailed guidance on the use of the EAST ranch.

THOSE are the documents that should be revisited under a consulting agreement.

Essentially the PROS master Plan 21, 1994 itself is fine and vacant from revision. . Please refer to the 3 afore mentioned documents especially the most recent "Final MEIR adopted in September 2009" for consideration as Board Packet inclusion and consideration.

Jim Bahringer.

[REDACTED]

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [BoardComment](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment Items 6E and 7  
**Date:** Thursday, December 16, 2021 3:56:26 PM

---

**Item 6E PUBLIC COMMENT:**

I ask the board to decline to confer this additional payment to General Manager Weigold. He earns a generous salary of over \$170,000, plus benefits, and received a \$20,000 retirement payment last year. The board has allowed him to reduce his work schedule to pursue a teaching position, for which he is presumably compensated. He is honorably retired from a senior position in the U.S. Navy, which gives him retirement support. Whatever his financial concerns, if he finds himself unable to manage financially, I suggest many of the excellent financial planning materials available. The district already pays him generously, and has been flexible in allowing him to pursue additional compensation through teaching and operating his private consulting company. The board should not add to his already substantial compensation.

**Item 7 PUBLIC COMMENT:** Utilities Manager Ray Dienzo's report is silent on the progress of the EWS/SWF/WRF Coastal Development Permit application. He also doesn't mention Gus Yates of Todd Groundwater and Cindy Cleveland of Cleveland Biological, who he promised would report to the board and the public at this meeting. They are conducting studies required for the CDP application. Mr. Dienzo has given his own reports of their work, but he is not the direct source. His reports are brief and, since he is not the original source of the data, incomplete and unsatisfactory.

His pictures of roots clogging sewer pipes on page 169 are eye-popping, though.

Two more permits for residential additions were approved, one adding a bathroom and the other a two-story addition. These are legal, but are a reminder that these improvements result in increased water demand, even without allowing new construction.

--

Christine Heinrichs